Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Fig. 2. In Fig. 2, the label "Prior Art" is added per the Examiner's request.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed March 24, 2009, claims 1-9, 15-20, and 30-32 were rejected. Additionally, claims 10-14 and 33 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Additionally, the drawings were objected to.

In the subsequent Advisory Action mailed May 22, 2009, the Examiner noted that Applicants' reply filed May 11, 2009, has overcome the rejections of claims 3-5 and 7-8. By dependency, the rejection of claim 6 must also be overcome because claim 6 depends from claim 3. Claims 3-8 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). No new rejections for claims 3-8 are presented in the Advisory Action.

Thus, the status of the rejections following the Office Action mailed March 24, 2009, and the Advisory Action mailed May 22, 2009, is as follows:

- 1. Claims 1, 2, 9, 15-20, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b);
- 2. Claims 3-8, 10-14, and 33 are objected to for depending from rejected base claims; and
- 3. The drawings are objected to.

Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks. No claims are added.

For reference, claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10-17, and 30 are amended. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite the limitations previously recited in claim 3. Consequently, claim 3 is canceled. Also, claims 4, 6, 8, and 30 are amended to depend directly from claim 1, rather than from canceled claim 3. Claims 5 and 10-17 are each amended to clarify the language of the claims. These amendments are supported by the original language of the claims, as well as the subject matter described in the specification of the present application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 10-14 and 33 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 10-14 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Also, although not explicitly stated in the Advisory Action, it appears that claims 3-8 are also objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, since no other grounds for rejection are presented in the Advisory Action.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is amended to include the limitations previously recited in claim 3, such that the subject matter previously recited in claim 3 is now presented in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. There were no intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 recites allowable subject matter. Consequently, claims 2, 4-20, and 30-33, which depend from claim 1, also recite allowable subject matter.

Additionally, while the Office Action provides a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, the statement is directed to specific aspects of certain claims and not necessarily all of the claims. Applicants note that the comments in the Office Action may have paraphrased the language of the claims and it should be understood that the language of the claims themselves set out the scope of the claims. Thus, it is noted that the claim language should be viewed in light of the exact language of the claim rather than any paraphrasing or implied limitations thereof.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action maintains the objection to the drawings based on the assertion that "the examiner believes the label 'Prior Art' is indispensable since it shows a user that Fig. 2 is not part of the claimed invention." Advisory Action, 5/22/09, page 2.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion as to the indispensable nature of the label, Fig. 2 is amended nevertheless to include the requested label in order to advance prosecution of the present application. This amendment to the

drawing of Fig. 2 is supported by the subject matter described in the specification at page 9, line 26, of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-9, 15-20, and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Daughton et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,300,617, hereinafter Daughton). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Daughton for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 recites allowable subject matter which was previously recited in claim 3, such that the allowable subject matter previously recited in claim 3 is now presented in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 1. There were no intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 recites allowable subject matter.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2, 4-20, and 30-33 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 2, 4-20, and 30-33 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 2, 4-20, and 30-33 may be allowable for further reasons, as described in Applicants' previous responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendment and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: June 16, 2009 Mark A. Wilson Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham PMB: 348

2530 Berryessa Road San Jose, CA 95132 Phone: (925) 249-1300 Fax: (925) 249-0111

Attorney Docket No. NL04 1251 US1 Serial No. 10/596,644